G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1907.

(Madras.)

File No. 304

Serial Nos. 1—8

Papers Filed.

Month February 1911.

SUBJECT.

Review petition of Kumaraswamy Tirumalachar for a reconsideration of Government order No. 2662 Dt. 6-12-05 declining to revive the posts of Addhikara and Itihasa in the Sree Ranganathaswami temple at Seringapatam

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

G.R.S. 11] 1907.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mysore)

NOTES.

File No. 304-07

FILL HEADING.

Renewal petition from Kumaraswamy Trimalachar praying for a re-consideration of Govt order declining the renewal of Addika and Archaka posts in the Srirangapatna Temple, abolished during the revision of Patak Path in 1900

From

Kumaraswamy Trimalachar minor through his brother and guardian Sreenivasiengar

No. Petition Dated 14-4-08 Received

Diary No. 4173	Enclos –	Spare Copies –	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Sl 2. To, – The Dy Commr, Mysore Dis^t^

Wochah no 5095 Dt 18.5.08

Forwards Sl 1 for opinion as to the necessity or otherwise of the posts claimed by the petr

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000 –3 4 07

Serial No. 3.

From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Dt.

Letter no 384 Dy 15.2.1910

Reports on Rl

This Case has been exhaustively dealt with in the recorded collection of File no 139-04.

(put w.s for 1904)

The 2 posts in question were abolished during the revision of the Jasoik Patti of Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Srirangapattana in 1905, the present petr having claimed them as the adopted son of the original Varawarddar on the authority of the marginally-noted 2 documents alleged to have been granted to the family, the Dy. Commrs. report was called for and having gone into the whole question, Govt under orders of the late Dewan, declined the revival of the posts as prayed for by the petr.

Saunad of the year Pramodoota Samvatsara, (Hag Y order of the year 878 by Divl Commr of Ashthagram - (Hag Y)

Hag X) G.O. no 2622-4 Dy 6-12-05)

The petr thereupon sought for a review of the above order for the following reasons:-

(Hag X)

1. That during the revision of the Jasoik Patti, his adopted father was dead and that the latter's Gumastha did not advance the petr's case to the posts which were abolished even in the month a

BPG—35,000—27-1-09

Serial No.

notice to the karavarddar's widow, thereby giving her an opportunity to substantiate her claim on the document (refd To) in her possession, and
2) that there is every necessity for the Addika Post is ~~bane~~ evidenced by the fact that at present under an altered designation, the duties are being actually performed.

The review petition was forwarded to the Dy. Commr for opinion & that officer reports that this is a fit case for favorable re-consideration by Govt

Submitted for orders

24.2.10

Lt Mukunda Ch Remind Tasildar Pattiyam Taluk.

27/2/10

Ordered, the Dy Com's recommendation be accepted for a ~~ordering~~ favl case.

The records show that petnr adopted Pattamdars Ch Ishwara and Addika & Karavarddar with a holding of B. 4-12. The former died in 1879, when the Tasildar Pattiyam was revised in 1900 the hereditary Karavarddar these offices were abolished (Vide remarks in Remind Tasildar Pattiyam book of Records). The first petitioner

(* Marg A)

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

Flag K (G.O. no 2622A Dy 6th Dec. 05)

rejected on the ground that the appointment was abolished because it was unnecessary.

This appointment however does not appear to be the reason for the abolition, for it is stated that a part of Addika only is newly created and one Viambathi Sinnivan Iyyan appointed till this piece of Chetti Parapattiyam being abolished. The Revised Taxation Return makes no reference to Chetti Parbattiyam but shows that the part of Sheristadar is abolished.

Flag A) (Report no 359 Dy 6-9-08)

Flag B. (Report no 359 Dy 31-5-07)

Mr. Sheldon the Committee ~~proposed~~ made elaborate proposals for providing both Putta Addika and Viambathi Sinnivan Iyyan with pleas Helegs and the Chetti Parapattiyam should be ~~vested~~ put in or be appointed to Addika Putt and Chetti Parapattiyam ~~vested~~ reverted to former of Viambathi Sinnivan Iyyan or the latter appointed a Parbattiyar of Kanipakam Vinayagar Temple & about [illegible] I do not think this is necessary. The Putta Addika being in lieu and when the Putta abolished in 1907 there was no heir except Lakshmi the widow

Flag K (Dy. Comm's Letter no 250 Dy 7th Nov 05) & Petition Dy 9-11-05

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

BPG—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

who did not urge the claim. It is also not known if there are any pleas against the adoption - Anyhow there does not appear to be any necessity to revise an arrangement which in the absence of the adoption, is quite right when made.

We may say that the petitioner's right to the addition had only been investigated when the post becomes vacant.

Draft submitted to Secretary & Chief Commissioner for approval and signature.
4/3/1910

2 G 2 1

Why should this appointment be assumed to be considered hereditary when the Sanad relied on contains no words to favour such a claim?

for Private Secretary
10/3/1910

7/3/10

Approved
10 3 1910

Issued 10/3/1910

To, The Dy Commr, Mysore District

Docket no 2352 Dt 17 3 1910

Enquires why the appointments should be assumed to be hereditary

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

when the Sanad recited on Customs no words to favor such a claim.

From, the Dy Commr, Mysore Distt.

Letter no 467 Dt 15.4.10

Submits his reply to the above query.

(after under disposal) Flag W

The Dy Commr invites reference to Endorsement no. 821 Dt 20th Jany. 1898 issued to Kumara Linnatiengar wherein it is stated among other things that it was learnt that the post was hereditary and ~~septah~~ reports that as the word "hak" is used only in Connection with hereditary appointments, the post may if possible, be regarded as hereditary and adds that no such assumption was made in his previous communication, but was merely observed that the allegation of the petr might be correct.

Submitted for orders to the Honble

5 - 2

AV 27/4/10 Ly

Ahmad 27/4/1910

The order proposed by the Inam Commr. may be issued

GPB—55,000—27.4.09

d Revenue
cretariat.

Mng File No. 304 of 1907

Serial No.

7

The Post having been abolished & when the appointment was otherwise disposed of has no present claim to any exceptional treatment. The reply proposed leaves it to Govt to do what will be proper then.

30/4/10

Let the draft of my reply be approved by the Legal Councillor's concurrence

Ag

2/5/1910

To, Kumaraswamy Srinivachar,

Endt no 2749 dy 17.5.1910

States that Govt are not prepared to alter the arrangements ordered on the revision of the Basoik Patte in 19 and adds that the question of his ha will be considered should the Addika post fall vacant.

To, The Dy Commr, Mysore Dist

no 2750 dy 17.5.1910

Forwards copy of the above

From, Kumaraswamy Srinivachar,

Petition dy 20-1-1911

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

12]
General and Revenu
Secretariat.

File No. 304 of 1907

Serial No.	
	Alleges that the Addika post is not abolished and the Temple Peshkar is attending to it and prays that it may be conferred upon him R. Secretary's order:- Not possible. Cntn note and put up Sub=
	Submitted with a Dft
	BV (1329) 13.2.1911 The Endt previously granted says that the appt has been abolished. But the Petr says that the post has not been abolished & that another man has been holding.
	Endt as per order. Is there any objection to his being kept on?
	RC 13/2/11 Issue. Mr and Mrs. can't have two Peshkars
	15/2/1911

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8 10

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 19

Serial No.	

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Muz. 1] Muz F 304-07-2

190

13/5

From

Muz F 304-07

To

The Dy Commr
Mysore District

Dated

Despatched 18.5.08

Received

General No. 5095
No.

Enclosure No. Nil

Adverting To Govt Pro no 2622 A dated 6th December 1905 directing on the petition of Kumara Swamy Tirumala chari, that it is not possible To continue the rents of Addika and Sthanika in the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple at Srirangapatam,

G P L—3,000—19-9-07

has the honour to forward herewith petn review-application regd no 4173 dated 14th April 1908 from one A Das individual praying for a re-Consideration of the order of Govt the Dy Comm is requested to report whether there is any necessity to review the posts claimed in question, and mark his opinion in regarding the revival of the appt

By order

R.P. 30/4/08 D(T) 15/5/08

Secretary

Note to the petr 12/5/08

D 1571
1909-10

From Mrs F 304-07-3
Mr Kantaraj Urs Esq: B
Deputy Commissioner
Shimoga District

To C. S. Balasundaram Iyer Es
Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of M
Genl and Rev. Depart, Mysore
Dated Branch
Despatched 15th February 1910
Received
General No. 384
No.
Enclosure No. 1 file

Recommends that the
Kaimar case of Kumara Th
-rumala Char a Pakadar to
the post of Addika and Sthika
in the Sri Ranganathaswamy
temple, is a fit one for the
favourable reconsideration of
Government.

Refer
Ag
17/2/10
W

No. 384
Enc. No. 1/Nil

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore Camp 15th February 1910.

To
C. S. Balasundaram Iyer Esq., B.A.
Offg. SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Nuzzai Branch

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 5095 dated 18th May 1908 forwarding the revision petition of Kumaraswamy Thirumala Char praying for a reconsideration of Government Proceedings No. 2622 A. dated 6th December 1905, relating to the posts of Adhika and Itihasa in the Sri Ranganathaswamy temple, I have the honor to submit the records of an enquiry made by the Peshkar of the temple, together with the opinion of the Amildar of Srirangapatam and the Sub Divisional

Divisional officer of French-Rocks.

From the Nirupa of the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur and the order of the Commissioner of Ashtagram Division dated 20th January 1878 produced by the petitioner, it is evident that the petitioner's adoptive father had an undoubted and unimpeachable hak to the barawad.

It is quite possible that the considerations alleged in para 3 of the petition may have led to the abolition of this barawad in the Revision of 1900. The duties and the title seem to have been then transferred to the Chikka Parpattegar ಪಟ್ಟೆಗಾರ Srinivasa Iyengar. There is thus no question of reviving the appointment.

From

From the Amildar's report, it will be that there is now a safe an inexpensive way of making amends if the Government are disposed to think that any injustice has been done to the petitioner at the time of the Revision

I have only to add that I consider this quite a fit case for the favourable reconsideration of Government

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant

For Deputy Commissioner

B.A.

Mysore District

Muz. 1]

190

From

To

The Dy. Commr.,
Mysore Dist.

Dated

Despatched 14th March 1910

Received

General No. 2332

No.
Mus. F. 304-07

Enclosure No. 1 Ltr.

Adverting to his
Letter no 384 Dy 15th Feby
1910
recommending that the case
of Kumara Srinivachar
a hakdar to the posts
of Addika and Stikasa
in the Sri Ranganathaswamy
Temple at Srirangapatna
is a fit one for the
favorable re-consideration

GPL—3,000--19-9-07

of Govt, has the honor.
to enquire why the
appointments should be
assumed to be hereditary
when the Sanad relied
on contains no words
to favour such a claim

2) The records are
herewith returned for
ref. and re-return.

By order,

(Sd.) [illegible]

for Secretary

VII 164 10 Sl 5

2 1907-12 1932

From M. Kantaraj Urs Esq: B.A
Muz: A: 304-07
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To C.S. Balasundaram Iyer Esq: B.A.
Offg: Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Genl & Rev Departts, Muzrai
Branch

Dated

Despatched 15th April 1910.

Received

General No. 467
No.

Enclosure No 1 file

States that the appointments of Addika and Ithihasa in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Srirangapatam may, if possible, be regarded as hereditary.

Refer
My
B...
Urs 16/4/10.

No. 467
Enc. No. 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore Camp 15th April 1910.

To
C. S. Balasundaram Ayy Esq. B.A
Offg. SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Muzrai Branch

Sir,

In reply to your docket No. 2352 dated 17th March 1910 enquiring why the appointments of Addika and Ithihasa in the Sri Ranganatha Swamy temple at Srirangapatam should be assumed to be hereditary when the Sannad relied on contains no words to favour such a claim, I have the honor to invite reference to copy of endorsement No. 821 dated 20th January 1878 issued

Muz. F. 304-07

issued to Kumara Thirumala Iyengar (filed with the accompanying records) in which the petitioner's adoptive father is recognised as the Hakdar. As the word "hak" is used only in connection with hereditary appointments in contradiction to the word "baraward" the appointment may, if possible, be regarded as hereditary. At any rate no such assumption was made in the previous reference from this office, in which it was only observed that the allegations of the petitioner may be correct.

The enclosures received with the docket under reply are herewith returned

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant

[signature]

for Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಂಕಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. $1 \times 6 = 6$

ಒಂದು ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಘನವು ಅದೇ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ವರ್ಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮವಾಗಿರುವ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಕಂಡುಹಿಡಿಯಿರಿ.

D 1264

మై|| కార్యదర్శి గారికి ఇంటర్వ్యూ రాయి అర్జీ

Attested
Signature

మై|| కార్యదర్శి గారి ఆజ్ఞ ప్రకారం ఈ క్రింది విన్నపాలు చేసుకొనుచున్నాను.

ఈ క్రింది విన్నపాలు చేసుకొనుటకు నన్ను ప్రేరేపించిన కారణములు ఏమనగా, నా శ్రీనివాస్ మై|| అంగార్పణ అనగా

శ్రీరంగపట్టణ శ్రీరంగనాథస్వామి దేవస్థానమునకు సంబంధించిన భద్రదీపమును [redacted] మై|| వారి కుటుంబమునకు అప్పగించిన పద్ధతి ప్రకారము ఆ కుటుంబమువారు ఆ దీపమును ప్రతిదినము సాయంకాలము వెలిగించుచు వచ్చుచున్నారు. ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఆ కుటుంబమువారికి ఇనాముగా 1900 వ సంవత్సరమునకు పూర్వము ఆరు ఎకరాల మాగాణి భూమి ఇవ్వబడినది. ఆ భూమి ఆ కుటుంబమువారి ఆధీనములో ఉండగా, ఆ భూమిని ప్రభుత్వమువారు స్వాధీనము చేసుకొని ఆ భూమికి ప్రతిగా ఆ కుటుంబమువారికి ఏటా రూ. 749 నగదు చెల్లించుచున్నారు. ఆ నగదు ప్రస్తుతము ఇవ్వబడుచున్నది.

ఆ భద్రదీపమును అప్పగించిన కాలమునాటి పరిస్థితులు ఇప్పుడు లేవు. ఆ కుటుంబమువారు ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇప్పుడు ఆసక్తి చూపుటలేదు. ఆ కుటుంబమువారి ఆసక్తి లేకపోవుటచే ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇప్పుడు ఎవరూ ముందుకు రావటంలేదు. కావున ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇప్పుడు ఎవరూ ముందుకు రానందున ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇవ్వబడుచున్న నగదును ఆ కుటుంబమువారికి ఇవ్వకుండా నిలిపివేసి ఆ నగదును ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇవ్వవలసినదిగా ప్రార్థన.

ఆ విధంగా నిలిపివేసిన నగదును ఆ దీపమును వెలిగించుటకు ఇవ్వవలసినదిగా ఆజ్ఞాపించవలసినదిగా ప్రార్థన.

కృతజ్ఞతాపూర్వకము

20.1.1911
బొంగళూరు

Illegible

File No.

Serial No. 8

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 2161 - ది 22/2/11
Mun 30407

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190

Date of issue

Signed by

To

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ಕಾಂಡ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಕಿಂಡ ತ್ರಿ—

ಪ್ರ ನ ವಿದಾ ಕೆ ಸ್ಥಳ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಳ

ಗಳು ದಿಂಡ ವಂಕೆ ಕಿಸ್ಥ ಕ್ಷ ಅಕ್ಷಿಂಡ್ಕ

ಗಳಿಸಿ ಕಿಂಡ ಅ ಉ ಅವ ಸ್ಥ ಕಿಂಡ

ಎಂಡಿ ಕಿಸ್ಥ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪ್ರ ದ ಸಾಂಡ್ಕ

ಅಕ್ಷಿಂದ ವಳು ಮು ಕಳ್ಳ ಅಡ್ಡ ಅಸ್ಥ

ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಎಂ

By order,

Sd/-
13/2/1911

Sec. to Govt.

Copy to the Dy Comm, No 216/25 dt 22/2/11.
Revenue Dept. in Contn of Misc 304-07
G.O. No. 250 dt 17-5-1910.

By order,

Sd/-
13/2/1911

Sec. to Govt.

13/2/11

List of enclosures,